

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-28 are pending in this Application.

Claims 1-10, 13-18, and 23-25 are currently amended. Claims 11 and 22 have been canceled. Applicants respectfully submit that support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and the drawings.

Claims 1-10 and 13-28 are now pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment. No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, claims 11-12, 13-17, and 18-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,665,838 (hereinafter “Brown”).

Reopening of Prosecution

Applicants note that prosecution has been reopened in view of an alleged new grounds of rejection. While Applicants do not necessarily agree with the prior art rejections set forth in the Office Action, amendments herein are made to expedite issuance of the Application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims to subject matter similar to those pending before the present Amendment in co-pending or subsequent applications. Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for the purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S. C. § 102(e)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1-28 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Brown.

Applicants respectfully note that to anticipate a pending claim, a prior art reference must provide, either expressly or inherently, each and every limitation of the pending claim. (M.P.E.P. § 2131).

The Office Action alleges that Brown teaches or suggests all of the claim limitations of claims 1-28. However, based on the arguments presented below, Applicants

respectfully submit that Brown fails to teach or suggest one or more of the claim limitations recited in each of claims 1-28.

Brown fails to disclose or suggest each and every claim limitation recited in claim 26. For example, claim 26 recites, in part, the feature of “code for accessing printable representations for the first multimedia document and the second multimedia document.” As discussed in the Application, a multimedia document stores multimedia information in electronic form. The term “multimedia information” is used to refer to information that comprises information of several different types in an integrated form. (Application: Paragraph [10]). However, Brown fails to disclose 1) accessing multimedia documents and 2) accessing printable representations of multimedia documents as recited. This is because Brown is directed to retrieving and processing web pages that comprise information of a single type in an integrated form with links to several different types of information in a distributed form. Specifically, the web pages themselves in Brown fails to correspond to the multimedia documents storing multimedia information in electronic form as recited in claim 26 because the stored web pages in Brown do not include information of several different types in an integrated form as understood in the recited multimedia documents. In other words, web pages ubiquitously consist of a document written in a text-based markup language, such as HTML or XML. HTML, for example, generally allows a document to be written with HTML tags that 1) specify the markup of inline textual content, and 2) specify links to another document (such as another HTML document, an image, audio file, etc.) for further inclusion of other textual/audio/visual content or for hyperlinking when the HTML document is rendered by a user’s browser or other HTML engine. Thus, accessing an HTML documents with the system (such as in FIG. 9) before being displayed in Brown fails to correspond to accessing a multimedia documents as recited in amended claim 26.

Moreover, Brown fails to disclose accessing “printable representations of multimedia documents” as recited in claim 26 because the HTML documents are merely a single type of information in a non-printable representation form. That is, they comprise the markup language, that only when rendered by the user’s browser or other HTML engine become a displayable or otherwise printable representation of the inline and linked data. Only after the

HTML document is rendered to include any linked content in an integrated form does the webpage become potentially analogous to a multimedia document as recited in claim 26 (yet, Brown does not disclose that the user's browser stores the rendered web pages in memory in an integrated form as recited in claim 26). However, Brown fails to disclose that any of the webpages after being rendered by the user's browser or any of the webpages after being rendered by Brown's system into a thumbnail are accessed as recited in claim 26.

Claim 26 further recites, in part, the features of “code for analyzing the printable representation for the first multimedia document in response to the input to identify at least one portion of the printable representation that satisfies the selection criterion” and “code for analyzing the printable representation for the second multimedia document in response to the input to identify at least one portion of the printable representation that satisfies the selection criterion.” (Emphasis added). Code as recited claim 26 is included for “generating a consolidated printable representation that includes the at least one portion of the printable representation for the first multimedia document and the at least one portion for the second multimedia document that satisfy the selection criterion.” Brown fails to disclose that any of the web pages after being rendered by the user's browser or any of the webpages after being rendered by Brown's system into a thumbnail are analuzed as recited in claim 26 to identify at least one portion of the printable representation that satisfies the selection criterion.

Yet, the Office Action still fails (even after the benefit of an Applicants' appeal brief highlighting the issue) to address how any of the current or former cited references disclose or suggest the features recited in amended claim 26 of “code for analyzing the printable representation for the first multimedia document in response to the input to identify at least one portion of the printable representation that satisfies the selection criterion” and “code for analyzing the printable representation for the second multimedia document in response to the input to identify at least one portion of the printable representation that satisfies the selection criterion.” (Emphasis added). The Office Action simply concludes that Brown discloses the above features in “analyzing multimedia information” by copying and pasting an already tenuous analysis as applied to claim 1. The Office Action again fails to address where Brown or any other reference analyses the printable representations of a plurality of multimedia documents as

recited in claim 26 to identify at least one portion of the printable representations that satisfy the selection criterion.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Brown fails to disclose each and every claim limitation as arranged in claim 26. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 26 is allowable over the cited references. Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 6 and 18 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claim 26, and others. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 7-10 and 19-22 that depend directly and/or indirectly from the independent claims XX respectively, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of the independent claims. Applicants further respectfully submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons.

For example, claim 27 recites, in part, the feature of “code for generating the consolidated printable representation comprises including the at least one page from the printable representation for the first multimedia document and the at least one page from the printable representation for the second multimedia document in the consolidated printable representation.” Brown fails to disclose that a consolidated printable representation is generated that includes at least one page from a rendered web page (i.e., “the printable representation for the first multimedia document”) and at least one page from another web page (i.e., “the printable representation for the second multimedia document” in the consolidated printable representation as recited. FIG. 8 of Brown shows a thumbnail and summary for every link of a web page requested by a user. (Brown: FIG. 6, step 610). Thus, Brown does not disclose that printable representations are analyzed as recited in claim 27 as discussed above. Additionally, in contrast to analyzing a printable representation for a first and second multimedia document to determine at least one page in the printable representation for the first and second multimedia document that comprises information that satisfies the selection criterion, Brown merely traverses each and every link to generated a thumbnail and summary.

Brown also fails to disclose or suggest each and every claim limitation recited in amended claim 1. Claim 1 recites the features of “analyzing with the processor of the computer system the multimedia information stored by the plurality of multimedia documents based on the

information in response to the input to identify portions of video information or audio information in the multimedia information that satisfy the selection criterion” and “extracting the identified portions of video information or audio information in the multimedia information with the processor of the computer system including at least a first portion of video information or audio information extracted by the processor from a first multimedia document in the plurality of multimedia documents and a second portion of video information or audio information extracted by the processor from a second multimedia document in the plurality of multimedia documents.” Brown, however, fails to disclose the above recited features as claimed.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 13 and 23 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claim 1 and 26, and others. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-5, 13-17, and 24-25 that depend directly and/or indirectly from the independent claims 1, 13, and 26 respectively, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of the independent claims. Applicants further respectfully submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 11-12, 13-17, and 18-22 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Appl. No. 10/001,891
Amdt. dated May 5, 2009
Reply to Office Action of February 5, 2009

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter, Reg. No. 53,437/
Sean F. Parmenter
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 925-472-5000
Fax: 415-576-0300
SFP:lls
61840279 v1